

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,200	11/25/2003	John H. Crowc	02307O-149730US	6782
20350	7590 05/01/2006		EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			SAUCIER, SANDRA E	
	TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANC	SCO, CA 94111-3834		1651	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/722,200	CROWE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Sandra Saucier	1651					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONET	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·,				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
•	-· action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application	٦.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
Copies of the certified copies of the prior							
application from the International Bureau		a in time reasonar etage					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		d.					
·							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/722,200

Art Unit: 1651

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 1. Claims 1-17, drawn to a first method of loading a biological sample using fluid phase endocytosis, classified in classes 424 or 435, subclasses various depending on the biological sample.
- II. Claim 18, drawn to the product of Group I, classified in classes 424 or 435, subclasses various depending on the biological sample.
- III. Claims 19-30, drawn to a second method, a method of dehydrating a biological sample comprising loading the sample by fluid phase endocytosis, drying the sample, classified in classes 424 or 435, subclasses various depending on the biological sample.
- IV. Claims 31-58, drawn to a third method, a method of dehydrating a biological sample comprising placing the sample into a solute, preventing a decrease in the loading efficiency gradient, drying the sample, classified in classes 424 or 435, subclasses various depending on the biological sample.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III, IV are distinct. Inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed are not connected in at least one of design, operation, or effect (e.g., can be made by, or used in a materially different process) and wherein at least one invention is PATENTABLE (novel and nonobvious) OVER THE OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable over the prior art) (MPEP § 802.01).

Art Unit: 1651

Group I does not require dehydration which is required by Groups III and IV methods. Thus, the product of Group I is distinct from the products of the method of Groups III, IV.

Inventions III and IV are distinct because the method of Group III requires that the loading be performed by fluid phase endocytosis while the method of Group IV does not require this step, but does require preventing a decrease in the loading efficiency gradient during loading which is not required in the method of Group III.

The processes are distinct from one another because they recite different and distinct steps which lead to different and distinct products.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case (2), the product may be made by a process of loading the biological sample with the help of poration, which would not by a fluid phase endocytosis process.

The several inventions listed above are independent and distinct from one another as they have acquired a separate status in the art and require independent searches, particularly with regard to the literature searches. Clearly, a reference which would anticipate one of the above groups would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious any of the others.

An undue burden would ensue from the examination of multiple methods which have distinct steps and end points. Burden lies not only in the search of US Patents, but in the search for literature and foreign patents and examination of the claim language and specification for compliance with the statutes concerning new matter, distinctness and

Application/Control Number: 10/722,200

Art Unit: 1651

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims in Groups I and II. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to

Application/Control Number: 10/722,200

Art Unit: 1651

retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Saucier whose telephone number is (571) 272-0922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,200

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, M. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866–217–9197 (toll-free).

Sándra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 Page 6